

REMARKS

Claims 1-39 remain in the application. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that this application be allowed and forwarded on to issuance.

The § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,347,398 to Parthasarathy et al. (hereinafter "Parthasarathy").

The Claims

Claim 1 recites a method of processing a multi-media editing project comprising:

- generating a request for one or more multi-media files for use in a multi-media editing project, the request being generated by a user computer that comprises part of a network where multi-media files are maintained in a network-accessible location;
- intercepting the request;
- ascertaining whether a requested multi-media file is located on the user computer *by checking one or more user-designated directories for the multi-media file*;
- retrieving the multi-media file if the file is located on the user computer; and
- seeking the requested file from the network-accessible location if the multi-media file is not located on the user computer.

1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its
2 subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. In support of its argument,
3 the Office cites to Parthasarathy column 9, lines 32 through 53 which is
4 reproduced below [emphasis added]:

5 Downloaded software components are *automatically verified* 72 by
6 *checking a digital signature and a digital certificate contained*
7 *within the software components* (e.g., with WinVerifyTrust).
8 However, security measures other than digital signatures and digital
9 certificates could also be used to verify a software component. In
10 another embodiment of the present invention, the software
11 verification step 72 is optional. For example, on a corporate
12 intranet, where all software components behind a corporate firewall
13 are automatically trusted and need no verification. The verified
14 software components are then automatically installed 74 (e.g., with
15 ICodeInstall) in various directories of a file system on the local
16 computer 34. After installation the software components are
17 registered 76 (e.g., with DllRegisterServer or ModuleUsage) in a
18 registry database on the local computer 34. *The registry database is*
19 *used to keep track of which software components are installed on*
20 *the local computer* 34. In another embodiment of the present
21 invention, the registration step 76 is optional. After registration,
22 selected software components are returned 78 to a requesting
23 application. Further details of method 66 will be explained below
24
25

17 Specifically, the Office argues that this excerpt teaches a method of
18 maintaining a registry database, which is checked (before the internet is
19 checked) when a file is requested. The Office reasons that since there is
20 no limitation on how the directories are designated by the user,
21 Parthasarathy meets the scope of this claim language, which states:
22 "checking one or more user-designated directories for the multi-media
23 file".
24
25

1 Applicant is unclear about what the Office equates with "user-
2 designated directories" as recited in this claim. Applicant has reviewed the
3 excerpt and is unable to find where user-designated directories is
4 mentioned at all. Further, this excerpt does not appear to disclose or
5 suggest checking one or more user-designated directories. Rather, it
6 appears to describe a method of *automatically verifying software* by
7 checking digital signatures and digital certificates. In addition, another
8 embodiment where the software verification step is optional is discussed.
9 In this embodiment, *a registry database is apparently used to keep track*
10 *of which software components are installed* on a local computer.

11 In contrast, this claim recites checking one or more *user-designated*
12 *directories* for a requested multi-media file. One example of how this can
13 be done is described in the specification starting on page 53 at line 9. This
14 excerpt is reproduced below for the convenience of the Office [emphasis
15 added]:

16
17 Step 4100 generates a request for a network-
18 maintained multi-media file. This request is ordinarily
19 generated by a multi-media editing application executing on
20 a user computer, such as any one of computers 4006-4010
21 (Fig. 40). Step 4102 intercepts the request locally. Step
22 4104 then ascertains whether the file or files referenced in
23 the request exist. Step 4106 determines one or more local
24 directories where multi-media files are, or have been
25 maintained. Specifically, as a user retrieves and uses multi-
media files, they can store them locally. When they store
them locally, they typically have certain *designated*
directories that contain the files, e.g.
"C:/myfiles/multimedia_files". Alternately, they might store
the files anywhere on their hard drive. *A user can then*
designate appropriate directories as directories that contain
multi-media files. One example of when a user can do this

1 is given below. Thus, when a request is intercepted, as in
2 step 4102, the software can quickly ascertain the directories
3 of interest (e.g. *the directories that have been designated by*
4 *a user as containing multi-media files*) that are likely to
5 contain the multi-media files. Step 4108 then checks the
6 *determined local directories* for the requested multi-media
7 file. This step is advantageous in that it can avoid checking
8 all of the directories of a hard drive which can be time
9 consuming. If the file is found locally (step 4110), then the
10 file is retrieved from its local location and used (step 4112).
11 If, on the other hand, the file is not found locally, step 4114
12 asks *the user to point to a local directory* where the multi-
13 media file might be stored. Step 4116 then checks the user-
14 designated directory and if the multi-media file is found, step
15 4112 retrieves and uses the file. If, on the other hand, step
16 4116 does not find the file in the local *directory designated*
17 *by the user*, step 4118 checks appropriate network
18 directories for the requested multi-media file. This step can
19 be implemented by sending on the request that was
20 intercepted at step 4102. It will be appreciated and
21 understood that *once a user designates a new local directory*
22 *(i.e. responsive to step 4114) that contains one multi-media*
23 *file*, the software will remember this directory and will
24 automatically check it when multi-media files are requested
25 in the future.

16 Applicant does not understand the Office's reasoning that there is
17 no limitation on how the directories are designated by the user. The fact
18 that there is no limitation on how the directories are designated by the user
19 does not appear to be germane because Parthasarathy does not appear to
20 teach or disclose checking one or more *user-designated directories*.
21 Hence, for at least this reason, this claim is not anticipated by this
22 reference and is allowable.

23 **Claims 2-11** depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending
24 from an allowable base claim.
25

1 **Claim 12** recites a method of processing a multi-media editing
2 project comprising:

- 3
- 4 • maintaining information on a local computer that comprises
5 part of a network having multiple computers, said
6 information being associated with multi-media files that are
7 maintained in a network-accessible location and that can be
8 temporarily stored on the local computer's hard drive; and
 - 9 • responsive to a request to retrieve a multi-media file from the
10 network-accessible location, using the information to attempt
11 to locate the requested file on the local computer's hard drive
12 *in one or more user-designated directories* before
13 attempting to retrieve the file in the network-accessible
14 location.

15 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its
16 subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. As discussed above,
17 Parthasarathy does not appear to teach or disclose one or more user-
18 designated directories as recited in this claim. As such, this claim is not
19 anticipated and is allowable.

20 **Claims 13-18** depend from claim 12 and are allowable as
21 depending from an allowable base claim.

22 **Claim 19** recites one or more computer-readable media having
23 computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a
24 computer, cause the computer to:

- 25
- maintain a list on a local computer that comprises part of a
network having multiple computers, said list being used to
determine which local *user-designated directories* have been
used in the past, or are currently being used to stored multi-
media files that are maintained in a network-accessible
location; and

- responsive to a request to retrieve a multi-media file from the network-accessible location, use the list to first attempt to locate the requested file on the local computer's hard drive.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. As discussed above, Parthasarathy does not appear to teach or disclose one or more user-designated directories as recited in this claim. As such, this claim is not anticipated and is allowable. Hence, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable

Claims 20-24 depend from claim 19 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 25 recites a method of processing a multi-media editing project comprising:

- receiving one or more multi-media files from a network-accessible location;
- locally storing the one or more multi-media files in a local *user-designated directory* on a user computer for use in a multi-media editing project;
- updating a list of local *user-designated directories* that contain or have contained multi-media files in the past in the event that the one or more multi-media files are stored in a local *user-designated directory* that is not contained in the list;
- responsive to receiving a request for a multi-media file that is maintained in the network-accessible location;
- first checking in all of the local *user-designated directories* on the list of local *user-designated directories* for the requested file; and
- second checking the network-accessible location for the requested file in the event the requested file is not found locally.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. As discussed above, Parthasarathy does not appear to teach or disclose one or more user-designated directories as recited in this claim. As such, this claim is not anticipated and is allowable. Hence, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable

Claims 26-29 depend from claim 25 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 30 recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to:

- maintain a list of local *user-designated directories* that are or have been used to store multi-media files on a local user computer, the multi-media files being accessible from a network storage location;
- generate a request for a multi-media file that is accessible from a network storage location, the request being intended for use in retrieving a multi-media file from the network accessible storage location;
- intercept the request;
- ascertain a requested file from the request;
- first, determine whether the requested file is locally available by checking all of the local *user-designated directories* maintained on the list and retrieve the requested file from a local *user-designated directory* if the file is locally maintained;
- second, seek the requested file from the network storage location if the file is not locally maintained;
- store the requested file in a local *user-designated directory* if the requested file is retrieved from the network storage location; and

- update the list to reflect the local *user-designated directory* if the local *user-designated directory* in which the requested file is stored is not on the list.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. As discussed above, Parthasarathy does not appear to teach or disclose one or more user-designated directories as recited in this claim. As such, this claim is not anticipated and is allowable. Hence, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

Claim 31 depends from claim 30 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim 32 recites a multi-media editing system comprising:

- a multi-media file locator object configured to intercept network-bound requests for multi-media files and determine whether requested files are locally maintained on a user computer *in one or more user-designated directories*; and
- a list associated with the file locator object and referencing local *user-designated file directories* on the user computer where multi-media files are stored, the list being used by the file locator object to determine whether requested files are locally maintained on the user computer.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that its subject matter is anticipated by Parthasarathy. As discussed above, Parthasarathy does not appear to teach or disclose one or more user-designated directories as recited in this claim. As such, this claim is not anticipated and is allowable. Hence, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

1 **Claims 33-39** depend from claim 32 and are allowable as
2 depending from an allowable base claim.

3
4 **Conclusion**

5 All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly,
6 Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the
7 Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a
8 Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for
9 the purpose of scheduling an interview.

10
11 Respectfully submitted,

12
13 Dated: 9/23/04

14 By: 

15 Lance R. Sadler
16 Reg. No. 38,605
17 (509) 324-9256